IN THE SPECIFICATION

Via the AMENDMENT PRIOR TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION submitted on $\emptyset 2/21/93$, Applicant had inserted an additional paragraph into the specification; which additional paragraph is entitled "Related Applications".

In the 3rd line of that paragraph, the term "Contination" is deleted and replaced with the term -- Continuation--.

In the 4th line, the term ", now abandoned" is deleted.

In the 8th line, the term --, now abandoned-- is inserted immediately after the term "11/23/83".

In the 9th line, the term --, now abandoned-- is inserted immediately after the term "08/14/80".

INITIAL REMARKS

In paragraph b. at page 2 of his latest Office Action, Examiner states that:

"The language presently used in the claims should have antecedence in the specification."

Applicant agrees, but fails to see that his specification falls short in that respect.

That is, Applicant believes the language presently used in the claims has clear antecedence in the specification.

More particularly, Applicant is of the opinion that a person having ordinary skill in the art pertinent hereto would have no difficulties whatsoever correlating between the various elements, sub-circuits and/or functions identified in the claims and corresponding elements, sub-circuits and/or functions described in the specification.

To demonstrate his position, Applicant presents the following analysis of exemplary claim 19:

19. An arrangement comprising:

an AC source functional to supply an AC power line voltage at a pair of AC power line terminals;

{The "AC source" corresponds to AC power supply S in Fig. 1, and is further described in the last paragraph at page 2 of the specification.}

rectifying and filtering means connected with the AC power line terminals and functional to provide a filtered DC supply voltage between a first and a second DC supply terminal;